

LOUISVILLE EVENING BULLETIN.

VOL. 4.

LOUISVILLE, KY., MONDAY EVENING, MAY 28, 1855.

NO. 202.

THE EVENING BULLETIN

IS PUBLISHED AT THE
OFFICE OF THE LOUISVILLE JOURNAL
Every afternoon at two o'clock, except on Sundays.
TERMS.

For week, payable quarterly, \$5.00
For annum, payable quarterly, \$15.00
Mail subscribers, per annum, in advance, \$4.00
Advertisements inserted in the Evening Bulletin upon the usual terms.
For advertisements transferred from the Louisville Daily Journal at half-price.

THE WEEKLY BULLETIN

IS PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT THE FOLLOWING RATES, PAYABLE ALWAYS IN ADVANCE:
1 copy, one year, \$1.00
5 copies, do, \$5.00
10 do, do, \$10.00
And each additional copy, .75 cents.
Advertisements inserted in the Weekly Bulletin upon the usual terms.
For advertisements transferred from the Louisville Weekly Journal at half-price.

MONDAY, MAY 28, 1855.

We publish this morning the rejoinder of "Silex" to our brief comments upon his first communication. It will be seen that he urges with characteristic ability that the Missouri compromise was neither legally nor morally a compact, and that the North enjoyed her fair share of the advantages of the compromise while it endured. His remarks under this last head are confessedly founded upon the conviction that our "whole article" suggested the impression "that the South received all the advantages contemplated by the compromise, and the North none," a conviction which we think wholly unwarranted by the terms of our article, and which we certainly did not intend to produce in the mind of any one. What we intended to express was simply that when the Representatives of the South united actively in the repeal of the Missouri compromise the South had exhausted or nearly exhausted its supposed advantages to herself, and that the North was then about to enter most largely into their enjoyment. And this our able friend will no doubt cheerfully admit. The South had secured Missouri and Arkansas; and the North, having secured Iowa, was about to secure Nebraska, Kansas, and Minnesota in like manner—excepting in the two latter cases the portions that lie south of the compromise line and east of the Mississippi respectively. So far from having any disposition to dwell invidiously upon this incontrovertible fact, we are by no means confident, indeed we can hardly believe, that it exercised a paramount and controlling influence even with those Southern Representatives who participated in the repeal of the Missouri compromise. Assuredly it inspired nothing but indifference or repugnance to that scheme in the bosoms of the Southern people. But its coincidence with the measure of repeal was altogether too striking to escape the wakeful suspicion of the North, and under the circumstances, we think should be regretted by the South as at least extremely ambiguous and unfortunate. With this explanation, we cordially commend our correspondent's historical review to the attention of our readers.

With regard to the legal character and binding force of the Missouri compromise, we have now but a word to say. "Silex" is certainly correct in denying to that measure the legal qualities of a compact; and his remarks, addressed mainly to this point, are just and unanswerable. But, so far as we are aware, unless perhaps in the loose parlance of the street, the Missouri compromise has never been esteemed or styled a compact in any other than a moral sense; and in that sense we think it richly deserved all the respect it ever received and more. Upon this point our ingenious correspondent in not conclusive. He says: "The Missouri compromise was established by a law which its opponents knew they could repeal whenever they could obtain a majority in Congress. Until repealed, it was submitted to by the South." Our friend, candid and impartial as is his nature, here allows himself, we fear, to think and speak as an ultra adversary of the compromise, with the passions and prejudices of the past blazing brightly in his bosom. We know his intense and chivalric devotion to the interests of the South, and we feel that it is small discredit to his fine judgment that it should occasionally yield to a passionate identification with the sympathies and resentments of that section. Whether it has done so in the present instance or not, we respectfully submit to his reflection the opinion of a Southern man, expressed at the period of the enactment of the Missouri compromise, and invested with something of the spirit which then pervaded the majorities of the representatives from both sections of the nation and the masses of the whole country. We quote from Niles's Register of March 11, 1820, with the simple remark that the Register was by far the ablest and deservedly the most influential paper published in any slaveholding State:

The territory north of 36 deg. 30 min. is "forever" forbidden to be peopled with slaves, except in the State of Missouri. The right, then, to inhibit slavery in any of the Territories is clearly and completely acknowledged, and it is conditioned as to some of them, that, even when they become States, slavery shall be "forever" prohibited in them. There is no hardship in this. The Territories belong to the United States, and the government may rightly prescribe the terms on which it will dispose of the public lands. This great point was agreed to in the Senate, 33 votes to 11; and in the House of Representatives by 134 to 42, or nearly 130 to 37. And we trust that it is determined "forever" in respect to the countries now subject to the legislation of the General Government. It is true that the compromise is only supported by the letter of the law, repealed by the authority which enacted it, but the circumstances of the case give to this law a moral force equal to that of a positive provision of the constitution; and we do not hazard anything by saying that the constitution exists in its observance. Both parties have sacrificed much

to conciliation. We wish to see the compact kept in good faith, &c.

We have been wont to regard this as the spirit in which the Missouri Compromise was actually conceived and established, and faithfully observed for more than thirty years, and, despite the skillful and powerful assault of our correspondent, we must so regard it still.

It is very true, as our correspondent says, that when a law of Congress is passed, whether it establishes a compromise or not, those who pass it and all others know that it may be repealed whenever a majority can be obtained against it, but it is also true that a law, establishing through an important compromise the pacification of the country and understood to have been adopted from mutual concession for the salvation of the Union, should not be repealed except for reasons amounting to something like an evident necessity. The very term "compromise," by which the law of 1820 was universally recognized and called at the time, and by which it has been known for between thirty and forty years and is known still, implies a moral sanctity that should not be lightly disregarded. Another compromise of surpassing importance was adopted in 1850, and, although the Senators and Representatives knew, and although the whole people of the United States knew, that each and all of the laws comprised in it might, like any other laws, be constitutionally repealed the very next year, there was and is a deep and pervading impression in the minds of all true patriots that the repeal would be a breach of faith dangerous to the Union. Well, the Missouri compromise was adopted at even a more fearful crisis than the compromise of 1850; it was rendered a holy thing to countless hearts by the virtue, the patriotism, and the matchless eloquence of the mighty men who were most active in securing its adoption and by its beneficent and glorious influences in hushing that stormy sea of strife which had threatened to overwhelm the ark of our liberty; it was consecrated by the acquiescence of the North, the South, the East, and the West, throughout the lifetime of one generation and a large portion of the lifetime of another; and, all this being true, it certainly should not have been repealed last year for any such considerations as then existed, especially as the whole atmosphere of the whole country was filled with warning voices, that the repeal would inevitably produce those tremendous evils which it has since produced—that it would, in short, endanger the entire fabric of our Government.

"Silex" promises, in his next, to show, "that, from first to last," the compromise "was repudiated and violated by the North." If any person can show this, we have perfect faith in our correspondent's ability to do it. We assure him that our readers await his "next" with lively interest.

[For the Louisville Bulletin.]

LELA.—THE LOST ONE.

BY HENRY T. HARRIS.

The bells which toll the passing hour of day,
The winds which sigh amid the leaves at even,
Whispered a requiem while the angels came,
And bore her spirit to its home in heaven.
She was a fair-haired girl of seventeen,
Whose heart was gladdened as a summer bird,
When far amid the forest solitude,
It caroled forth its low, sweet notes unheard.
Her sunny curls, like shattered sun-beams, lay
Upon her brow as sunbeams on a cloud,
And softly blended with the loosened folds
Of her last winding sheet—the ghastly shroud.
The rose had faded from her velvet cheek,
But still the lily gleamed in beauty there,
As if 'twere nourished by the mellow light
Which fell in showers from her soft sunny hair.
Her hands upon her paleless bosom lay
Like petals down within a downy nest,
And seemed to guard the dusty door—from whence
Her soul had flitted to its Eden rest.
They bore her to the pale, and realms of shade—
That gentle one—the loved and early dead:
They paid the last and tribute of a tear
With broken sighs above her lowly bed.
No sculptured tablet marks her place of sleep,
No flowers bloom in radiant beauty there,
And giant oaks stand sentinel to guard
The low, sweet slumbers of a form so fair.
Sleep, Lela, sleep: no sound disturbs thee now—
No dissonant shrill thy throbbing breast,
For hush above you—'tis a hush of rest.
Hea, hea, beneath the "Tree of Life," a rest.
Thou art a shining angel—long-loved one—
Who sitst at where the silver fountains play—
Upon whose wings the starry beams of heaven
Shine in bright splendor through eternal day.
ROSE VALE, KY., 1855.

VIRGINIA.—The vote for Governor in 1851 stood, for Summers, 60,286; for Johnson, 67,427. The Democratic majority 7,141. In 1852 the majority for Pierce, over Gen. Scott, for President, was 15,281. Cass's majority over Taylor in 1848 was only 1,548. At the State election in 1852, the Whigs elected 16 Senators, and the Democrats 34; to the House the Whigs elected 65 members, and the Democrats 87. The whole number of votes cast for Governor, in 1851, was 127,713; the whole number cast in 1851, for President, was 129,595.

LYNCHING AT WESTON, MISSOURI.—A man named Phillips, who, it is said, handed to McCrea the pistol with which the latter shot Clark at a Kansas meeting, was tarred and feathered at Weston, Mo., on the 17th inst. He then went to Leavenworth, and, on the 18th, the people of that place were getting up an excitement against him.

HORRIBLE DEATH.—Dr. M. P. Morgan, of Vanderburg co., Ind., came to his death on the 16th inst. under the following circumstances: He came home intoxicated, and his wife and three children went to a neighboring house. Shortly after, the house took fire and he perished in the flames.

A fellow was arrested in Portland yesterday on a charge of stealing \$16 and a pistol.

THE WASHINGTON UNION.—The Washington Union suggests that Gov. Gardner's whole object in putting his veto upon the bill to eject Judge Loring from office was to subvert the cause of the Know-Nothing party in Virginia. This shows what sort of creature the editor of the Union is. No editor, with an honest pulsation in his whole body, no editor with a single drop of blood in his veins better than the saliva of a toad or the vile secretion of a polecat, would ever think of making so disgraceful a suggestion.

The editor of the Union, in his article making this attack upon Gov. Gardner, assails our late suggestions as to a compromise between the true patriots of the North and those of the South. Alluding to what we said as to the possibility of an amicable adjustment of any honest differences of opinion in the two sections as to the fugitive slave law, he states, that, if we meant anything, we meant "that the South should agree so to modify the fugitive slave law that the question of ownership shall be tried and settled by a jury in the free States where the slave may be arrested." Now the fellow knows, that, in the very articles he is commenting on, the principal suggestion which we made in relation to the fugitive slave law, the only suggestion which we dwelt on in relation to the modification of that law, was that the law, if any modification at all should be deemed necessary by the patriotic portion of the North, should be so modified as to secure to a fugitive slave a speedy trial by jury in the place he escaped from. This was the point that we especially elaborated; and the editor of the Union, in saying, that, if we meant anything, we meant that the question of ownership should be tried and settled by a jury in the free States, is guilty of as infamous a lie as a tongue fashioned for the exclusive purpose of lying could ever utter. We are aware that the editor of the Union is fighting for his bread and meat, but this is no apology for his abominable calumnies. He can obviate all necessity for vituperation by the use of a halter or a grape-vine; and, if his fear of the devil prompts him to live as long as he can, he might as well live by stealing as lying. Suppose he make another effort to get a few thousand dollars from the U. S. Treasury under false pretences. To be sure his last effort in that way was branded by the unanimous action of Congress as an attempt to swindle, but he may be more lucky next time. Swindlers are said to grow adroit by practice.

FIRE.—A frame cottage on Madison street between Third and Fourteenth, owned and occupied by Mr. Wm. Kellum, mate on the steamer Jacob Strader, was destroyed by fire on Saturday evening. A thief took advantage of the alarm occasioned by the fire (Mr. Kellum not being at home) and stole \$140 in gold and a \$20 bill on the State Bank of Ohio.

On Saturday night the grocery-store of W. J. Clark on the Point near the saw-mills was partially destroyed by fire.

About 12 o'clock last night a false alarm was raised, for the purpose, it was understood, of settling a difficulty between two of the companies, the Lafayette and the Relief. Some fellow got into the Relief Engine House, tapped the bell three times, and then jumped out of the back window before the warden saw him. The Relief did not ring any more, and the Union, American Eagle, and Mechanic gave no alarm, the watchmen in the wards where they are located being cognizant of the purpose of the alarm. But the bells of the Lafayette, Kentucky, Hope, and Rescue were rung for some time.

An inquest was held at Evansville, on the 22d inst., over the body of a man found floating in the river. It was doubtless that of a passenger on a steamboat. We give a description, by which the friends of the deceased may possibly be able to identify the body. He was of medium height, about thirty years old, heavy set, and had dark brown hair. He had on a black cloth coat and pants and black satin vest, fine boots, red top, laced. On his person were found a gold hunting lever watch, with heavy gold vest chain, eleven \$5 gold pieces, and 75 cents in silver; no papers except a newspaper dated this month; a copper baggage-check with "417" on it. Verdict of the jury—supposed accidental drowning.

LEXINGTON RACES.—The race on Wednesday, best three in five, was won by Murphy's Glencoe gelding, Frank Harper. Time, 1:47—1:47—1:48.

On Thursday, the first race, two mile heats, was won by Viley's Wagner mare, Florida. Time, 3:42—3:43. The second race, mile heats, was won by Harper's Nolte filly, Mary Leach. Time, 1:47—1:47.

On Friday, the first race, two mile heats for three-year olds, was won by Campbell's Wagner filly. Time, 3:47—3:52—3:47—3:47. The second race, mile heats, was won by Harper's Helen Swigert. Time, 1:48—1:47—1:48.

SERIOUS ACCIDENT.—Michael Faron, an Irishman, who has been employed at the United States Hospital as a servant, fell from the top of an omnibus late Saturday evening, on Main between Brook and Floyd streets. He was picked up by Mr. J. W. C. Steuarnagel and carried to his residence, where he was kindly cared for until medical aid was procured. His right leg between the knee and ankle was badly fractured, and his head slightly hurt. He is now at the Marine Hospital.

A free negro named Freeman, who resided in Alton, Ill., was lately shot by officers from St. Louis while in the act of running off slaves from Missouri. He made his escape, but died from the wounds received a few days ago.

To the Editors of the Louisville Bulletin:

THE REPEAL OF THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE—No. 2.
GENTLEMEN: You conclude your reply to my letter of the 17th inst. by asserting that you do not regard this discussion as "a matter of much current moment," and that "it concerns the welfare of the country more nearly at this crisis to compose existing difficulties than to review dead ones." It may be true that the adjustment of existing difficulties is of far more importance than all other questions connected with the Missouri compromise, and I wish to offer some suggestions upon that subject before causing this correspondence. But how are we to approach that adjustment without fully understanding the origin and nature of those difficulties? Those who shut their eyes to the past will certainly prove blind to the future.

If the South has been guilty of such bad faith, such injury and wrong, as to justify the excitement prevailing in the North, reparation should be made. But if the Missouri compromise was established, not by an irrevocable compact, but by a law liable to repeal, and was adopted with a knowledge of that liability and of the strong though ineffectual opposition of the South; if it overthrew in the Territories the foundation of republican government; if it excluded the South from vast territories to which she had equal rights with the North, and gave her only a promise to do what the North was previously clearly bound to do, and which the North failed to perform notwithstanding the enormous consideration exacted; if it was a wrong to the South, forced upon her by the North; and if it has been violated and disregarded by the North—then it ought to have been repealed; the North has no right to complain, and the South owes her no reparation.

You replied to me with great ingenuity and eulogium. I shall answer you with facts:

1st. The Missouri compromise was not a compact. In saying this, I do not rely upon technicalities. It was not a compact either legally or morally. You will admit that, in a legal sense, it was not a compact; that the members of Congress, if they had all united, had no authority to make such a compact; that they could only enact a law, subject, like every other law, to be repealed. But you contend, that, morally, it was a compact, and as such entitled to "almost the same force as a positive provision of the Constitution of the United States." I contend that, viewed as a compact, it was a palpable violation of a positive and highly important provision of the Constitution, and entitled to no force whatever.

One of the great objects of the framers of the Federal Constitution, and of the States that sanctioned it, was to protect each and every State against the power of any and all other States. Hence it is declared, that "no State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation" (art. 1, sec. 10.) Both of the Senators from Virginia, and twelve out of fourteen of her Representatives, opposed the compromise to the last. Other Southern States were represented by opponents of the compromise, whilst a majority of the members of Congress from several Southern States voted for it.

If the last mentioned States had entered into an express compact with the Northern States to exclude slavery from the Louisiana territory north of 36 deg. 30 min., the compact would not only have been void, but would have been denounced from one end of the country to the other, as a reasonable confederation, as an attempt by a majority of the States, in violation of the Constitution, to trample upon the rights of the minority. The Missouri compromise was established by a law which its opponents knew they could repeal whenever they could obtain a majority in Congress. Until repealed it was submitted to by the South. But if an attempt had been made to establish it by a compact between the States, whose Representatives sustained it, it would not have been submitted to; therefore deny that it was acquiesced in by the South as a compact, and I protest against the attempt to give it that character, when it is certain that, if it had been made the subject of a compact, it would have been treasonable, and void, and spurned by every patriot in the land whether North or South.

2dly. You assert that the compromise "was fulfilled in practice by the North," and that "when its provisions promised to inure to the advantage of the North, it was repealed by the agency of a few of the Representatives of the North and the mass of those of the South." The inference from your whole article is, that the South received all the advantages contemplated by the compromise, and the North none. Look at the facts.

In 1803 France ceded to the United States the territory of Louisiana, embracing the country now comprised in the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, and Iowa, and the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, and most of Minnesota.

After the acquisition of California and New Mexico, the North contended that Southerners could not hold slaves in those territories; that the law of Mexico did not recognize negro-slavery; that those territories came to us subject to that law, and must remain subject thereto until Congress should repeal the Mexican law and authorize slavery.

According to that reasoning it is clear that Southerners had a right to hold slaves anywhere in the territory of Louisiana, because the law of France recognized slavery there, and the territory came to us subject to that law.

But this is not all. The treaty of cession provided that "the inhabitants of the territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess."

At the date of the cession there were 1300 slaves in the territory now belonging to Missouri. The owners of these slaves, and the slaveholders who subsequently settled in the territory upon the faith of the Federal Constitution, of the French law recognizing slavery, and which remained unrepealed, and of the treaty of cession, were unquestionably entitled to be admitted into the Union upon terms of equality with the original States, the majority of which were slaveholding States when the Federal Constitution was adopted. If the territory had come to us as free territory, subject to a law prohibiting slavery, and if slaveholders had occupied it in violation of that law, there might have been some ground for opposing their admission, some basis for a compromise. But as matters stand there was no such ground, no such basis.

By the ordinance of 1787, slavery was prohibited in the "Northwest Territory," forming now the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. When Ohio applied for admission into the Union in 1802, the South

had the same right to object to it, as the North had to object to the admission of Missouri in 1820. The South had the same right to say, "Ohio shall not be admitted, unless the residue of the Northwest Territory is relieved from the ordinance of 1787," as the North had to say, "Missouri shall not be admitted unless slavery is excluded from the residue of the Louisiana territory north of 36 deg. 30 min."

It was under such circumstances, with such claims upon the country, with such rights, that the people of Missouri, at the session of 1818-19, applied for admission into the Union. It was conceded that there were over 60,000 inhabitants in the territory. No objection was made on that score.

But, upon the motion of a Northern man, by Northern votes, the bill for the admission of Missouri was amended in the House so as to require the people of Missouri to adopt in their State constitution a clause forever prohibiting slavery in the State. This was called the "restriction clause." The bill as amended passed the House and went into the Senate, but was not acted upon at that session. At the next session of 1819-20 the application was renewed.

The House, in opposition to the whole Southern delegation, again inserted the "restriction clause." In the mean time, the Senate passed a bill for admitting Missouri without restriction or conditions upon the subject of slavery; that bill the House rejected. Afterwards, upon the motion of Judge Thomas, of Illinois, the Senate adopted an amendment by which the "restriction clause," prohibiting slavery in Missouri, was stricken out, and in lieu of it a clause was inserted prohibiting slavery in the residue of the Louisiana Territory north of 36 deg. 30 min. The bill, thus amended, finally passed both houses. This is what has generally been called the Missouri compromise. What was the basis of it?

The people of Missouri were entitled to admission upon terms of equality with the original States. No restriction was ever imposed, nor could be imposed, upon any of the original States in regard to slavery. The people of every State have a perfect right to regulate their domestic affairs to suit themselves. The attempt to impose such restriction upon the people of Missouri was a palpable violation of their rights. They had a right to be admitted without such restriction. The South had a right to demand, and did demand, that they should be thus admitted. The North refused thus to admit them. Finally, a portion of the Southern members of Congress, in order to get rid of the restriction upon Missouri, voted with the North for excluding slavery from the residue of the Louisiana Territory north of 36 deg. 30 min. Here, as in another notable instance, the North first denied to us an unquestionable right, and then made the pretended concession of that right the basis and consideration for excluding us from territory to which we had an equal right with the North. The North gave up the "restriction clause," which she had no more right to impose on Missouri than I have to take your purse, and in consideration thereof she forced the South to surrender Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and most of Minnesota—territory six times as large as Arkansas, which was below the line. Nor was Arkansas exclusively appropriated to the South, as the territory north of the line was to the North. The people of the North, whilst they forbade slaveholders to go north of the line, retained the same right with us to go south of it.

True, Arkansas was afterwards admitted as a slave State; but not under the compromise. The compromise act made no reference whatever to the territory south of the line. It left our rights as to that territory precisely as it found them. If we had no right to occupy Arkansas before the act, we had none afterwards. But, as has been already shown, slaveholders had a right to occupy Arkansas, and to be admitted into the Union after occupying it, independent of the compromise act. If, however, you insist that the North would not have consented to the admission of Arkansas as a slave State but for the compromise, I will not dispute the proposition; it only proves that the Northern members of Congress were as fanatical, as regardless of our rights, as unconcerned about the Union of these States, in 1836 as in 1820. Moreover, if the South got Arkansas by the compromise, the amount was balanced by the admission of Iowa as a free State. It will not be disputed, that the compromise gave that State to the North. What then becomes of your assertion that the compromise was repealed "when about to enure to the advantage of the North?" Again: From 1820 to 1854 the compromise act excluded slaveholders from Kansas, Nebraska, and Minnesota Territories large enough for half a dozen States as Kentucky. Did it not during all that time enure to the advantage of the North? Was it of no advantage to the North that for 34 years she had the exclusive right to occupy those territories and to bring them in as States? The North got Iowa, and it was not our fault that she did not get more. The compromise act of March 6, 1820, was strictly obeyed and "fulfilled in practice" by the South. In my next, I will undertake to show that from first to last it was repudiated and violated by the North.

SILEX.

LOUISVILLE, May 24, 1855.

[From this morning's Journal.]

VIRGINIA ELECTION.

BALTIMORE, May 26.

The 4th Congressional District of Virginia gives Wise 1,493 majority, with Cumberland and Powhatan to be heard from.

WASHINGTON, May 26.

A despatch from Faulkner says that he is elected by 400 majority, and that Page county gives Wise and Faulkner 960 majority—a gain of 200 over Pierce's vote.

BALTIMORE, May 26.

A report prevails that Kabawba has given Flournoy 1,600 majority, but it needs confirmation.

St. LOUIS, May 24.

A despatch from Kansas says that in Leavenworth District the pro-slavery ticket has a majority. Pro-slavery men are elected in every district.

Boston, May 25.

It is said that warrants were issued from the police court to-day against P. Stevens, of the Revere House; Mr. Rice, of the American; Mr. Parker, of Court Square; and other prominent landlords, for violating the new liquor law.

New York, May 24.

A propeller left this city yesterday with merchandise for Chicago and Milwaukee, which is to be delivered without transhipment. This is the first trip by steam to the Upper Lakes.

MONDAY EVENING. MAY 28, 1855.

A CANDIDATE AT LAST.—It was telegraphed from Lexington on Saturday that James O. Harris, of that city, was the Democratic candidate for Congress in that district.

Several thousand warriors were at Ash Hollow.

Amount of Wool Grown in the Cape Colony and Australia.—From reliable data received at the State Department, it appears that the quantity of wool furnished by the Cape of Good Hope Colony from 1840 to 1852, inclusive, was 3,859,748 pounds; furnished by Australia during the same time, 256,008,415 pounds; furnished by the Cape Colony during the year 1852, 773,505 pounds; furnished by Australia during the same year, 32,500,000. Number of sheep in the various districts of the Cape Colony, 4,496,000; number of goats, 1,093,000. The wool is valued at 10d. per pound in the colonial market.—*Wash. Union.*

2,000 Fresh Clams in the Shell
(most delicious) just received this
morning by express. To be served
in our Restaurant or sold out of the
case in quantities to suit.

MAJOR: 20 BAKING AND PRESERVING ICE-
CREAMS, JELLIES, CAKE, &c.—Lemon, Rose, Va-
nilla, Bitter Almonds, Orange, &c., for sale by
R. S. RINGGOLD.

